

PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-O

PC-O1

From: Tim OBryan [timothy.obryan@verizon.net]
Sent: Monday, July 16, 2012 2:35 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Cc: tobryan@verizon.net
Subject: Comments on 405 Expansion
Importance: High

Comments and Recommendations on the EIS for the Proposed 405 Freeway Expansion

As a resident I am directly impacted by the expansion project. I live backed up to the 405 sound wall on Martha Ann. We have lived here for approximately 29 years. The original sound wall was not built high enough and when that was pointed out to Cal Trans, their engineers came out and said we were right but they should have built a 16 foot wall but could not add four more rows of blocks to make it right as the footing was not built to handle a 16' wall. However, they could add two more rows of block or add a 4' section of steel...we opted for the steel because it was higher. Now you have widened the freeway some more. Aren't you supposed to mitigate the error for the sound previously made with this current build? And now you want to add more noise with another build?

Current wall along some of Yellowtail and Martha Ann is too low and inadequate to meet OSHA standards I had requested through Christine Burns that my property be used for noise studies but she could not control where the noise reading would be taken, taking noise readings in appropriate locations will show the db noise level exceeds standards. I had also requested that at least along the 405/605 bordering Seal Beach and Rossmoor that sound deadening asphalt or at least asphalt be used to resurface all the lanes on this portion of the freeway much like what was done on the 22 freeway in Garden Grove.

The noise and pollution has increased substantially since then and with the current 405/605 connector project. Sound measurements were not taken adequately in the most impacted areas.

The pile driving and heavy equipment operation has created cracks in my private walls, decks and has caused the tile to begin falling off into my pool. I received a claim form from Christina and will fill it shortly.






Properties should not be degraded further for this expansion project without proper safety and safeguards to the residents. There are thousands of residences that are and will be impacted by this project. There is also an elementary school, Hopkinson Elementary, within a few hundred feet of this construction. The filth and dirt that comes into our neighborhood requires washing down our house and cars on a daily basis...want proof come to my home. One can only imagine the particulates that are airborne for children and residents to breathe on a daily basis.

This newly proposed project will make traffic congestion worse. You could put a hundred lanes out there and you will still create a mess. There is too much converging of traffic moving over to get off or on to the North Bound 405 from the 22 Freeway, Seal Beach Blvd, 7th Street (22West off ramp) & 605 Freeway. The more lanes you have added the worse it has become as vehicles are crisscrossing each other. Also what happens when your proposed widening gets to the 605 Freeway/LA County Line where there is no proposed widening? What kind of bottle neck are you going to create? Freeway lights have been installed and they are 10- 15' above the freeway wall and right against the wall so that the light shines into residents back yards all night long. Proper reflective lenses should have been installed to keep the light out on the traffic lanes and not in our backyards.

Stop the expansion project until CAL Trans can resolve all of the issues to the satisfaction of the residents and community.

Tim & Lynnette O'Bryan
12681 Martha Ann Drive
Los Alamitos, CA 90720
562-596-8906

PC-O2

 I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet											
Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.											
Meeting Venue (please check one of the following): <input type="checkbox"/> Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College <input type="checkbox"/> Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium <input type="checkbox"/> Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center <input type="checkbox"/> Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center											
<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Name (First and Last):</td> <td>ALVARO OCHOA</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Organization:</td> <td>Labor Local 652</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Address (Optional):</td> <td>11219 Island Ave WHITTIER CA 90605</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Phone Number:</td> <td>562 310 7495</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Email address:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>		Name (First and Last):	ALVARO OCHOA	Organization:	Labor Local 652	Address (Optional):	11219 Island Ave WHITTIER CA 90605	Phone Number:	562 310 7495	Email address:	
Name (First and Last):	ALVARO OCHOA										
Organization:	Labor Local 652										
Address (Optional):	11219 Island Ave WHITTIER CA 90605										
Phone Number:	562 310 7495										
Email address:											
Comments: En muchos casos los trabajadores de la construcción han estado sin empleo por 8 meses a un año y medio. Esto en efecto ha causado que pierdan sus casas.											
(Space for comments continued on reverse)											
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around; align-items: center;">     </div>											

PC-O2 Translation

In many cases, construction workers have been unemployed from eight months to a year and a half, they have, in fact, caused them to lose their houses.

PC-O5

4525 Ironwood Ave.
Seal Beach, CA 90740
July 12, 2012

Smita Desponde
Caltrans District 12
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA 92612

RE: 405 DEIR/DEIS Comment Period

PC-O3

From: O'Donnell, John [JODonnell@Semprautilities.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 12, 2012 1:23 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: Feedback re: Toll Roads/Lanes

I read recently that an option for the widening of the 405 freeway included a toll lane. I am **200% opposed to any use or even consideration of building toll roads/lanes**. I don't know how much more I can say to show my strong feelings about toll roads. Our taxes are pretty high already and there should be enough money to build roads on public rights of way without a toll.

John O'Donnell
Cell: 714-889-8625
Email: JODonnell@SempraUtilities.com

PC-O4

From: O'Donnell, John [JODonnell@Semprautilities.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 2:24 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: 405 widening feedback

I prefer **option #2** of those listed. My preference would be to add one carpool lane and one general purpose lane however I WILL NOT SUPPORT ANY DEVELOPMENT OF TOLL lanes. My opinion is that the 91 freeway near Imperial is a prime example of what **NOT** to let happen.

Sean O'Donnell

The DEIR for the 405 improvement project does not take into account the gridlock that will happen when there is no more extension of the lanes past Seal Beach Blvd and the 605 freeway that is Northbound. As for Southbound, perhaps that is where the widening should take place, south of Valley View, as the area in the southern portion of Orange County is where there will be development and expansion. There is no more spare land for homes to be built in Seal Beach, which is the end of the Orange County line. It is foolhardy and seems like spendthrift to spend money where it is not needed. All of the widening of the freeways should stop of Valley View, since Los Angeles County is not going to cooperate and widen their portions of the freeway. In addition, the Seal Beach-College Park East sound wall should remain intact as there would be no need to move it if the project stops at Valley View.

If the project must go ahead, it is recommended that Alternative #1 be adopted, rather than build more lanes which will result in more cars to be gridlocked by lack of spaces. In case you haven't been aware, if you look at any area where lanes have been added, this does not prevent traffic jams as more cars fill each lane.

Why didn't Orange County spend money to plan better uses of property at El Tero when land was available for the airport. Why is it that we in Seal Beach have to suffer because of the selfish and greedy people in Irvine who rather grab the land for development of houses and businesses without consideration of the rest of the population in Orange County. This is a basic reason why travel on the 405 will increase, because people in South County will want to get to the LAX on the 405.

To leave the planning of any of OC freeway up to OCTA and Cal Trans seems ridiculous after seeing what the interchange between the 22, the 5 and the 57 has caused. A MAJOR DISASTER with miles-long waits to get to the interchange and the freeway you want. Who designed that mess?!! If this will be the future of how freeways and interchanges are designed, heaven help us who have to live with their designs.

I am a resident of College Park East. Any decisions you make regarding the widening of the freeways in the area of Seal Beach and the moving of the sound wall affects my air quality and the value of my home. We are an established neighborhood and do not want changes made to our area.

Sincerely,

Joyce Okazaki
Joyce Okazaki

PC-O6

From: Stephanie Olin [stephi@stephanieolin.com]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2012 6:00 PM
To: Parsons, 405.decomments
Subject: 405 widening

To the committee of the 405 widening. Absolutely NOT on making a toll road..it would be disastrous..it already is a mess..please, please, please NO..make more public lanes..that is what we need!!!!

Sincerely,
MR and MRS Derek Olin
Huntington Beach

} 1

PC-O7

Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief,
Caltrans-District 12, "Attn: 405 DEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA, 92612

Subject: State Route 405 (I-405; San Diego Freeway) between SR-73 and I-605
and Draft EIR/EIS

I am concerned about the impacts the State Route 405 improvement project will have on our community. I am especially concerned about Alternative 3 which will widen the San Diego Freeway in the City of Costa Mesa and convert an existing car pool lane to a toll lane.

Alternative 3 would require that the Fairview/I 405 interchange be demolished and rebuilt, even though it was just rebuilt three years ago. Residences and public parks near the I- 405 will be adversely affected both during construction and upon completion of the project. Problems include air pollution, noise, and degradation of the visual quality of our neighborhoods. Ramp closures at Harbor, Fairview, and South Coast will not only inconvenience residents, but impair access to the many businesses which contribute to our local and regional economy.

In addition,

} 1

Please include these comments in the public/administrative record for this project and the project EIR/EIS. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours truly,

Martha S O'Neil
(Name)

1980 Lemnis Dr Costa Mesa CA
(Address) (City)

☒ Please keep me informed about future hearings and future steps in the review process for the I- 405 project.

PC-08

Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief,
Caltrans-District 12, "Attn: 405 DEIR-DEIS Comment Period"
2201 Dupont Drive, Suite 200
Irvine, CA, 92612

Subject: State Route 405 (I-405; San Diego Freeway) between SR-73 and I-605
and Draft EIR/EIS

I am concerned about the impacts the State Route 405 improvement project will have on our community. I am especially concerned about Alternative 3 which will widen the San Diego Freeway in the City of Costa Mesa and convert an existing car pool lane to a toll lane.

Alternative 3 would require that the Fairview/I 405 interchange be demolished and rebuilt, even though it was just rebuilt three years ago. Residences and public parks near the I-405 will be adversely affected both during construction and upon completion of the project. Problems include air pollution, noise, and degradation of the visual quality of our neighborhoods. Ramp closures at Harbor, Fairview, and South Coast will not only inconvenience residents, but impair access to the many businesses which contribute to our local and regional economy.

In addition,

Please include these comments in the public/administrative record for this project and the project EIR/EIS. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Yours truly,

Mary K. O'Neill

(Name)

1164 Bismark Way Costa Mesa, Ca. 92626

(Address)

(City)

☒ Please keep me informed about future hearings and future steps in the review process for the I-405 project.

PC-09



I-405 Improvement Project Public Hearing Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

- ☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): <i>Fermin Ornela</i>	
Organization: <i>Labor Local 652</i>	
Address (Optional): <i>19951 Gavilan Rd. Brea, Ca 92510</i>	
Phone Number: <i>951 442 1614</i>	Email address:


Comments: *They have exhausted their unemployment benefits if they are not working they can't help keep the economy going*

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



PC-O10

PC-O11



I-405 Improvement Project

Public Hearing

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): IGNACIO ORTEGA





Organization: Laber Local 652


Address (Optional): _____

Phone Number: 714/360-8622 Email address: _____

Comments: THE PROPOSING IS GOOD
REDUCE THE TRAFFIC LESS TIME IN THE
FREEWAY.
MORE JOBS FOR ORANGE COUNTY

(Space for comments continued on reverse)



I-405 Improvement Project

Public Hearing

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (Draft EIR/EIS). Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than July 2, 2012.

Meeting Venue (please check one of the following):

☐ Monday, June 4, 2012 – Orange Coast Community College
 ☐ Thursday, June 7, 2012 – Rush Park Auditorium
☐ Wednesday, June 6, 2012 – Westminster Community Center
 ☐ Thursday, June 14, 2012 – Fountain Valley Senior Center

Name (First and Last): ARTURO ORTIZ





Organization: Laber Local 652

Address (Optional): 11982 TIZURO AV HAWTHORNE 90250

Phone Number: (310) 675-2298 Email address: _____

Comments: The 405 freeway from 73 to the 605 freeways
is the busiest in the nation
It will also help our infrastructure of the
bridges and streets.

(Space for comments continued on reverse)

PC-O12

From: Chris Osborn [cj.osborn@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 05, 2012 5:57 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: 405 Expansion

I believe that the planned widening of the I-405 in Orange County has its merits. However, rather than mitigating the traffic and congestion problem, this plan would make it worse, especially for those in commuting or living in LA County. The recent widening of the Orange County I-5 demonstrates that this 'county-isolated' freeway widening model has already been tried and does not work. It creates a bottleneck and congestion worsens. The only way to remedy this problem is to include numerous regions in the planning process. Cross-county freeway planning should be the standard. I commend the efforts of Orange County to widen the 405, however it is a tremendous oversight to exclude Long Beach and other neighboring LA County cities in the planning process. This needs to change.

Sincerely,

Chris Osborn
 245 Quincy Ave
 Long Beach CA

1

PC-O13

Constituent Comment

District AD67

Ostrich, Enea

3621 Camella St

Seal Beach CA 90740-2820

eneao@hotmail.com

07/16/2012 08:13 pm

List Name: Transportation and Infrastructure - Oppose

Stance : Oppose

Issue Name: Transportation and Infrastructure

Notes :

Regarding the 405 freeway Project in OC: please take note that my community here in CPE of Seal Beach, CA is asking for Alternative 1, which keeps the wall intact in our tract. There is not enough room for parking as it is in this neighborhood and taking 5-10 feet from our Almond Avenue as can happen in Alternative 2 and 3 is not acceptable. Alternative 1 is the way to go and keeps the wall intact and all the cut de sacs in CPE safe from work on the 405 freeway. Thank you for contacting those at OCTA and Cal Trans regarding this very important issue:)

1

PC-O14

PC-O14 Continued

July 16, 2012

Fm: Ostrich, Enea

Dear CalTrans and OCTA:

The auto is being forced to surpass any other form of transportation in Orange County—it's a true shame, for this country was made of railroads and buses way before any of these freeways came to be.... To be frank, the main reason for this letter in the first place is because I don't want the wall by Seal Beach's College Park East to be touched at all. The explanation at the June 26th meeting in Seal Beach clearly spelled out from OCTA representatives that expanding the freeway was the likely choice. How can Bill Kempton from OCTA say that voters wanted expansion when they voted for Measure M? That's plainly not true. IMPROVEMENT is what I voted for, thank you. I will explain myself further as to what doesn't work for the alternatives that have been presented for the 405 Freeway Project.

#1, I live in one of the cul de sacs by the freeway in College Park East, Seal Beach. It is actually the longest, Camelia Street, which curves into Banyan Avenue, then to Columbine Street where it ends. There is not much room right now for cars going to and fro on Almond Avenue, which is the street by the freeway wall in our trac that people park their cars on street on street sweeping days or when there is an overflow any day or night. If you have perused the area you will plainly see that there isn't room for any type of construction to be conducted, much less the end result of 8-10 feet pushed in, if there were to be construction, as OCTA has proposed in two of its alternatives (ALT 2 and 3). This is because we will lose the parking on that street, which is called Almond. There are at least ten houses on average in the cul de sacs along the freeway, with approximately 30 on the three streets that exist in our cul de sac. If you can just imagine when our streets are paved every couple of years, you can imagine that each and every one of those homes has to park on Almond Street and there is no other choice. Another fact is that Almond Avenue is the ONLY street that we can all exist on as well, so the strategy for any road construction company is to coordinate the street paving so we all can either exist onto Lampson by Basswood or the eastern part of the cul de sacs to Candleberry via Daisy Street or Oleander. You can see that it's not easy for paving, and Almond is truly our only way out just like in College Park West where there is only way out of the trac via the tiny bridge they have. Construction on that street is ludicrous enough to deal with without considering Cal Trans coming through with large bulldozers and creating an earthquake which they already have with the clean-up they have already done on the freeway in the past year or so.

#2, I worry for the air quality and increase of noise. With the proposed Alternative 2 and 3 the increase in traffic would bring more noise and most specifically more smog into our trac. Why do we have to have more traffic? That doesn't make sense when you consider the reduction of it through plain common sense—build better rail and trolley systems and increase bus schedules. Not only does that produce more jobs for Southern Californians, it also helps with cleaner air. I currently work in the Port of Long Beach and there have been tremendous waves in cleaning the air in recent years due to the Clean Air Act of 2003. In fact, the wildlife, be it on land or in the sea has increased in activity and it is amazing to see it happening—wonderful! In case you may not know, I have written about nature in an article for my hometown Sun Newspaper, so protecting wildlife is very important to me. So if we are to protect nature, why not ourselves too? Something to think about for all of us.

July 16, 2012

Fm: Ostrich, Enea

#3, I worry about the increase of traffic on Lampson Avenue in the past year due to bypass of freeway that has caused residents to cram into four lanes (two on each side). This is not a major street and it is not equipped to handle that many cars on a long term basis. I have seen increase of accidents which is totally detrimental to our trac because there is no other outlet—you are stuck on this street until you get to whatever street you can possibly get out by exiting Tulip Street on the eastern part of it or Basswood by the furthest western part. It is not easy and during construction times this is accepted, but on a long term basis it is not because we should be allowed to use that street for exit to where we need to go. We can either exit out to reach Garden Grove freeway via Valley View Street or to the 405 Freeway via Seal Beach Blvd. We do not have another outlet street—this is it! Please consider this for we have already been invaded with Cal Trans trucks parking their loaders on the freeway wall from time to time and we don't have room for them—we just don't because we need all the space for our own cars and trucks on street sweeping days!

#4, I think the freeway should be shifted from the median point over instead of cutting into a private neighborhood of people. One of the things I heard from Mr. Kempton at the June 26th meeting in Seal Beach was that there is a lot of money being used for this 405 Freeway Project. That is commendable, but if you are to use tax payer money, then you need to LISTEN to us and really sink your thoughts into what people are really saying when they say what they want. No one wants toll lanes because they are wasteful. In fact I listened to a lady at a car shop this weekend who uses the lanes and she says traffic is backed up on the 73 freeway but she uses the toll lanes and it's perfectly clear. She loves it because it helps her for work. Wow, it helped one person among, from the sounds of it—very few people at the peak hour of the morning and night time. Hurrah OCTA—you nailed it—you have a passive freeway there that is not being utilized for its worth. That makes total nonsense. I have had the unprivilege of driving on the 91 freeway frequently for my daughter's softball tournaments in the past and I have seen traffic all day, no matter what time it is—peak or not! The four general purpose lanes are jammed during the "peak" hours as you call it and the toll lanes are completely and utterly wasted—clear as a bell, dang it. I don't want toll lanes for that reason—a complete waste.

#5, I hope to see the diamond lane we currently have completely revamped to a "continuous" lane instead. If you do that it can work better so that it is not wasted. You could even add one more without disturbing the freeway wall by Seal Beach and that would work for us and work for the freeway too. I do not see how the toll lanes would help with traffic flow because at the L.A. County line there is only four lanes. To decrease from 7 lanes into four when you go from the O.C. to L.A. County line will bring traffic on the 405 North to a halt. That is bad because Seal Beach is the last city on the O.C. line and we are suffering right now due to the lines on the freeway being relined so that it accommodates the construction work. That is not a natural curve when you are approaching 7th street and getting on it or the 605 freeway feels crunched right now—it is ludicrous and blamed on the construction, but I don't see the purpose of a year-long construction that doesn't seem to have improved any traffic—only seems to have made it worse. How do you propose that future construction of extra lanes would improve this scenario after the connectors are fixed? It brings more confusion and with confusion there is increase in accidents we already have—thank you! I recently was involved in a rear end collision on Seventh Street and it was the other driver's fault because he rammed into me when I was at a stoplight. I foresee more

PC-O14 Continued

July 16, 2012

Fm: Ostrich, Enea

accidents like this because people that would normally go on the freeway are taking detours that they are not accustomed to and think that they can keep on driving like they are on a freeway when in fact they are on the end of a freeway and onto a surface street instead.

5

Lastly, if Cal Trans can convince OCTA to bring forth what was actually promised in Measure M, then maybe we the public can actually be satisfied to hear what will be happening on the 405 freeway in the future. Keep the road clear of traffic without adding exhaust in our lanes. You need to increase the flow on the general purpose lanes and in this neck of the 405 Freeway. I say your answer is in Alternative 1--- period. Thanks for reading this letter.

6



Enea Ostrich

CPE resident

3621 Camelia Street,

Seal Beach, CA 90740

eneao@hotmail.com

PC-O15

July 3, 2012

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a College Park East resident in Seal Beach, California with my wife and two daughters who are six and three years of age. I strongly oppose moving the sound wall between Primrose Circle and Aster Street. I am very concerned about the detrimental impact that the expansion of the freeway into Almond Street to the sound level, the pollution level, and the devaluation of my property.

1

As I am writing this letter from my house the noise level is disturbing. If the 405 freeway is expanded into Almond Street the noise level will become more disturbing. Currently we have trouble sleeping in the evening due to the freeway traffic and during the day we need to keep our doors and windows closed due to the excessive noise from the freeway.

2

I am very concerned about the pollution level since the automobiles from the freeway emit hazardous chemicals. With the automobiles closer to our College Park East community and my family we will be breathing an increased amount of the hazardous chemicals. In addition, if the Los Angeles County does not expand their freeway once it reaches their county, the 405 next to my home will become a bottleneck and increase the concentration of the vehicles and the pollution.

3

Lastly, the expansion of the freeway will decrease the value of my property. As people search to purchase houses they do not want to live too close to a freeway. Therefore, if the freeway is moved into our College Park East neighborhood the value of the properties will decrease. When the potential buyers are evaluating the homes they will be discouraged by the freeway noises, pollution, and fear that they freeway will be expanded again.

4

Once again, I strongly oppose the expansion of the 405 freeway into the College Park East community for the safety and well being of my family and hundreds of other families. Please do not expand the freeway.

5

Sincerely,

Alan Otani



PC-O16

From: Ray Ott [ott@mindspring.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2012 2:32 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: I-405 Improvements

Something does need to be done to help traffic flow on the 405, now and going forward. But we all know that the 405 will always be congested no matter what we do. We can only help make the problem less serious.

Option 3 is not the way to go. You know why if you have paid any attention to the public input you have received.

In my opinion Option 2 seems to offer the best "value" given benefits received for the costs (both dollars and disruptions) incurred.

Ray Ott
Costa Mesa

1
2

PC-O17

From: harriet ottaviano [hbjotto90740@yahoo.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 8:48 PM
To: Parsons, 405.dedcomments
Subject: 405 Improvement Project

As a resident of Seal Beach, I would like to raise the following concerns about the 405 Improvement Project:

Issues:

- LA County has no plans to add additional lanes at the county line (at least not for 10-15 years, if ever). Stopping the additional lanes at the county line will cause:
 - o Increased traffic gridlock as cars try to merge down one to two lanes at the county line -- how far south/west will the backup extend along both the 22 and 405 fwy's?
 - o Due to prevailing on-shore winds, there will be an increase noise & pollution from idling northbound vehicles trying to merge down to go up the 405. Air quality impacts for this area are not discussed in the EIR. Why not?
 - o Residents of the College Park East neighborhood will likely experience greater health risks attributable to increased vehicle emissions.
 - o EIR did not study this scenario.
- Getting on the northbound 405 at SB Blvd
 - o Has already become more dangerous as the first two lanes exit at Seventh Street and the next two lanes become the start of the 605 fwy; cars entering the northbound 405 fwy at SB Blvd will have to cut over 4 lanes to get into a lane that will go north on the 405.
- Excess traffic
 - o Will spill onto Lampson Ave, which is already being used as a bypass for the 405.
 - o Will spill onto Seal Beach Blvd, attempting to circumvent the gridlock at the Seal Beach Blvd. fwy entrances
- Toll express lanes
 - o Will only serve the people who can afford to use them and require car pools to be at least three people per vehicle which will cause more use of the general purpose lanes. *This alone defeats the whole purpose of this "improvement" project.*
 - o Will bypass local exits for local shopping areas causing a loss of business and sales tax revenue
 - o Rates will change hourly depending on amount of use of the toll lanes as a means of traffic management (less use, decrease rates; too crowded, increase rates).
 - o Toll lanes would rely on and perpetuate congestion. The rates would be set so that the toll lanes flow free.
 - o The majority of the commuters would ride in the free lanes. This creates a social inequity.
- Suggestions:
 - o End the 405 Improvement Project at Valley View Street and use the existing seven lanes of 405 between Valley View Street and the LA County line in any manner desired for the optimum traffic flow.
 - o If either Alternatives 2 or 3 are chosen, end either one or both of the new lanes at Valley View so that they only have to take away one or no lanes at the county line instead of 2 lanes.
 - o Use rubberized asphalt on the 405 between Valley View and the LA County line to minimize noise
 - o With a center line movement, a 4 foot inside shoulder and 405 realignment, the Almond Avenue sound wall will not need to be moved into SB College Park East.
 - o A 4 foot inside shoulder on the south side of the freeway is acceptable, why not on the north side of the freeway? The soundwall would not need to be moved.

1
2
3
4
5

Thanks you for your attention to these concerns.

Harriet Ottaviano
4532 Ironwood Ave.
Seal Beach, CA 90740
562-430-8492
College Park East Resident

RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-O

Response to Comment Letter PC-O1

Comment PC-O1-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Future predicted peak-hour traffic noise levels along Martha Ann Drive are expected to rise from zero to 1-dB for any of the alternatives. Soundwalls for this project are only eligible for reconstruction and replacement in-kind when an existing soundwall must be removed, relocated, and replaced in-kind along the project alignment where space is needed for the proposed project's additional lanes or required safety features. In addition, most residences adjacent to the project already have the current maximum allowable soundwall height of 16 ft. For the areas with soundwalls less than 16 ft in height, such as locations represented by Receivers R6.52 through R6.59 and R6.64 through R6.70, there are no impacts predicted to occur. Receivers R6.52 through R6.59 (street addresses 12251 through 12541 Martha Ann Drive) are actually predicted to experience a drop in traffic noise levels of approximately 4 dB due to a soundwall that is part of the WCC Project that preceded this project. Receivers R6.64 through R6.70 (street addresses 12101 through 11881 Martha Ann Drive) are protected from traffic noise impacts by a 14-ft-high soundwall along the southbound I-405 to northbound I-605 connector.

Soundwalls S1226 and S464 have been included to address gap closures for areas along Yellowtail and Martha Ann drives.

Rubberized and open grade asphalt can reduce the traffic noise from 2 to 7 dB depending on the original roadway surface conditions. If a roadway is new and smooth, the reduction is much less than when the roadway surface is old with cracks and uneven slabs. The FHWA policy does not allow the use of pavement type or surface texture as a traffic noise abatement measure because it can lose its effectiveness over time. Presently, FHWA and several state transportation departments are conducting research to determine the longevity of the noise-reduction characteristics of rubberized asphalt.

Open grade rubberized asphalt was used on SR-22 in Garden Grove by OCTA as a demonstration project. A soundwall along this elevated portion of SR-22 would have blocked exposure of the car dealerships from the SR-22 traffic.

Please also see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment PC-O1-2

It appears that this comment pertains to the WCC Project; therefore, please direct your comment to the OCTA Community Relations Office (550 South Main Street, Orange, CA, 714-560-5376).

Comment PC-O1-3

The ongoing WCC project will reduce the weaving taking place within the segment of I-405 between SR-22 (near Valley View Street) and I-605 by providing HOV direct connectors between SR-22 and I-405 and between I-605 and I-405. Currently, vehicles using the carpool lanes on I-405, SR-22, and I-605 must weave across all of the GP freeway lanes to move between the carpool lanes on the three freeways. With the HOV direct connectors, these weaving maneuvers will be eliminated.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles county line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment PC-O1-4

In regards to the current freeway lighting as part of the WCC Project, please see Response to Comment PC-O1-2. The Draft EIR/EIS includes Measure VIS-21 on page 3.1.7-86 to reduce lighting impacts to homes.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O2

Commentario PC-O2-1

Las agencias de Caltrans y Orange County Transportation Authority les gustaría agradecerle por haber participado en el proceso ambiental para el proyecto de ampliación de la autopista de San Diego (I-405). Su comentario fue considerado durante el proceso de selección de la “Alternative Preferida”, como esta escrito en el reporte llamando en ingles “I-405 Improvement Project Final EIR/EIS.” Se le notificará en la dirección proveida en su Comentario cuando el reporte “Final EIR/EIS” va a estar disponible para revisarlo.

Comment PC-O2-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O3**Comment PC-O3-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

We acknowledge the opposition to tolling. In addition to tolling to raise revenue to construct the Express Lanes in Alternative 3, tolling is proposed as a congestion management tool. Slow-moving congested freeway lanes have lower and unstable throughput compared to uncongested lanes. During peak periods, the GP lanes on I-405 are forecast to be heavily congested with lower throughput (approximately 1,200 vehicles per lane per hour) than the Express Lanes, whose throughput will be managed to approximately 1,700 vehicles per lane per hour. For an explanation of how this management works, see the Draft EIR/EIS, page 2-20. By providing more throughput per lane through management of the Express Lanes, traffic in the GP lanes would be reduced and congestion eased; for two conditions with the same total number of lanes and congested conditions, congestion in the GP lanes would be less if two of the lanes were managed to increase their throughput. See the rows of Table 3.1.6-14 labeled “Brookhurst Street to SR-22 East” for a comparison of the throughput of Alternatives 2 and 3 with the same total number of lanes. Please also see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O4**Comment PC-O4-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. See Response to Comment PC-O3-1 and Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O5**Comment PC-O5-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line. While population and employment growth are centered in the south, traffic congestion is forecast to increase in the project corridor, as shown in the Draft EIR/EIS, Tables 3.1.6-4, 3.1.6-5, 3.1.6-12, and 3.1.6-13, including in the area of I-405 in Seal Beach.

Dropping the additional GP lane in Alternatives 1 and 3 upstream of I-605 near Valley View Street, as suggested in the comment, would create a chokepoint at the drop location because there would be no roadway to receive the lane's traffic. Carrying that lane to I-605 and providing a full two-lane exit at the beginning of I-605 provides a location for ending the lane that has the capacity to receive the lane's traffic. Consideration was given to a design option that would drop the second additional lane included in Alternative 2 just south of SR-22. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-O5-2

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-O5-3

Development of the property at El Toro in Irvine is unrelated to the I-405 Improvement Project. The SR-22/I-5/SR-57 interchange is also unrelated to the I-405 Improvement Project.

Comment PC-O5-4

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O6

Comment PC-O6-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification and Opposition to Tolling.

Response to Comment Letter PC-07**Comment PC-07-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Response to Comment PC-B20-1.

Response to Comment Letter PC-08**Comment PC-08-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Response to Comment PC-B20-1.

Response to Comment Letter PC-09**Comment PC-09-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-010**Comment PC-010-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-011**Comment PC-011-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred

Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O12

Comment PC-O12-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line. With respect to coordination across the county line, please see Common Response – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, COG, and the City of Long Beach.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O13

Comment PC-O13-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O14

Comment PC-O14-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-O14-2

The highest traffic noise level from a freeway occurs when traffic is at full capacity but flowing at the posted speed. Noise levels are reduced substantially when traffic is at stop-and-go conditions. Future traffic noise levels are predicted for the free-flowing conditions, and soundwalls are recommended to provide noise abatement for the highest possible traffic noise that can be produced by the freeway. Please see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

As described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, emissions will be reduced under all of the build alternatives compared to the future No Build Alternative, and no permanent adverse project-related air quality effects were identified. MSATs have the greatest potential to affect the health of residents located adjacent to the project. Although the various alternatives would place travel lanes closer to some residences, it is anticipated that MSAT exposure, including DPM, would be less than existing conditions. MSAT emissions are likely lower than existing levels in the design year as a result of EPA's and California's control programs that are projected to further reduce MSAT emissions. Please see Common Responses – Air Quality and Health Risks.

Alternatives with light rail and bus rapid transit are included in the Draft EIR/EIS in Section 2.2.7, Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Consideration. That section explains each of those alternatives and why they were eliminated.

Comment PC-O14-3

The additional lanes on I-405 under the build alternatives will encourage traffic currently diverting from I-405 to local streets to avoid freeway congestion to remain on the freeway.

Comment PC-O14-4

The SR-91 Express Lanes are highly successful and very efficient. They do not eliminate congestion in the GP lanes; they provide an option to that congestion to motorists willing to pay a toll. The tolls are set at the rates necessary to maintain high-speed operations. For an explanation of how this management works, see the Draft EIR/EIS, page 2-20. For additional information, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

Comment PC-O14-5

Alternatives 1 and 2 would provide continuous access to the HOV lanes. With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

Comment PC-O14-6

We acknowledge your support for Alternative 1.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O15

Comment PC-O15-1

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. Please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.

Comment PC-O15-2

The highest traffic noise level from a freeway occurs when traffic is at full capacity but flowing at the posted speed. Noise levels are reduced substantially when traffic is at stop-and-go conditions. Caltrans typically does not build soundwalls higher than 16 ft due to seismic issues, but the soundwall along Almond Avenue is 18 ft high. Even an 18-ft-high soundwall would not eliminate the traffic noise, but it would reduce it to be in compliance with the regulatory requirements. Bedrooms of the two-story houses that are located facing the traffic noise would be exposed to the traffic noise even with an 18-ft-high soundwall; therefore, closed windows would reduce exposure to high traffic noise levels. Future traffic noise levels are predicted for the free-flowing conditions, and soundwalls are recommended to provide noise abatement for the highest possible traffic noise that can be produced by the freeway. Please see Common Response – Noise/Noise Analysis.

Comment PC-O15-3

As described in Section 3.2.6 of the Draft EIR/EIS, emissions will be reduced under all of the build alternatives compared to the future No Build Alternative, and no permanent adverse project-related air quality effects were identified. MSATs have the greatest potential to affect the health of residents located adjacent to the project. Although the various alternatives would place travel lanes closer to some residences, it is anticipated that MSAT exposure, including DPM, would be less than existing conditions. MSAT emissions are likely lower than existing levels in the design year as a result of EPA's and California's control programs that are projected to further reduce MSAT emissions. Please see Common Responses – Air Quality and Health Risks.

Comment PC-O15-4

The I-405 Improvement Project may have an effect on property values, but it is not likely to be a major change because I-405 is an existing facility within Orange County. In addition, Caltrans

has found no literature, studies, or evidence that property values decrease because of freeway widening near a home. Please see Common Response – Property Values.

Comment PC-O15-5

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O16**Comment PC-O16-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

Comment PC-O16-2

We acknowledge your support for Alternative 2.

Response to Comment Letter PC-O17**Comment PC-O17-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment was considered during identification of the Preferred Alternative as described in the Final EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

With respect to a potential bottleneck at the Los Angeles County line, please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

MSATs have the greatest potential to affect the health of residents located adjacent to the project. Although the various alternatives would place travel lanes closer to some residences, it is anticipated that MSAT exposure, including DPM, would be less than existing conditions. MSAT emissions are likely lower than existing levels in the design year as a result of EPA's and California's control programs that are projected to further reduce MSAT emissions. Please see Common Response – Health Risks.

Comment PC-O17-2

Under the No Build Alternative, vehicles entering I-405 northbound from Seal Beach Boulevard must merge one lane left to access I-605 and one more lane left to continue on I-405 northbound. Under all of the build alternatives, one lane change plus a lane merge downstream of the SR-22

westbound off-ramp would be required to reach I-605 and two additional lane changes to reach I-405.

Comment PC-O17-3

The additional lanes and improved performance on I-405 under the build alternatives will encourage traffic currently diverting from the congested freeway to local streets to remain on the freeway.

Comment PC-O17-4

The SR-91 Express Lanes serve motorists from every income group. With respect to the proposed change in the HOV occupancy requirement for free use of the Express Lanes, please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling. Motorists not meeting the HOV occupancy requirement for free use of the Express Lanes who elect to use the free GP lanes would free up capacity in the Express Lanes for other users. Tolls will be set to keep the Express Lanes operating at uncongested levels serving more traffic per lane than a congested GP lane. Slow-moving congested freeway lanes have lower and unstable throughput compared to uncongested lanes. During peak periods, the GP lanes on I-405 are forecast to be heavily congested with lower throughput (approximately 1,200 vehicles per lane per hour) than the Express Lanes, whose throughput will be managed to approximately 1,700 vehicles per lane per hour. For an explanation of how this management works, see the Draft EIR/EIS, page 2-20. By providing more throughput per lane through management of the Express Lanes, traffic in the GP lanes would be reduced and congestion eased; for two conditions with the same total number of lanes and congested conditions, congestion in the GP lanes would be less if two of the lanes were managed to increase their throughput. See the rows of Table 3.1.6-14 labeled “Brookhurst Street to SR-22 East” for a comparison of the throughput of Alternatives 2 and 3 with the same total number of lanes.

Comment PC-O17-5

Dropping the additional GP lane in Alternatives 1 and 3 upstream of I-605 near Valley View Street, as suggested in the comment, would create a chokepoint at the drop location because there would be no roadway to receive the lane’s traffic. Carrying that lane to I-605 and providing a full two-lane exit at the beginning of I-605 provides a location for ending the lane that has the capacity to receive the lane’s traffic. Consideration was given to dropping the second additional lane included in Alternative 2 just south of SR-22, but this was rejected due to the level of congestion such a bottleneck would create. Carrying the second lane to the SR-22 West exit ramp provides a location for ending the lane that has the capacity to receive the lane’s traffic.

Rubberized asphalt is not proposed under this project. FHWA policy does not allow the use of pavement type or surface texture as a traffic noise abatement measure because it can lose its effectiveness over time. Presently, FHWA and several state transportation departments are conducting research to determine the longevity of the noise-reduction characteristics of rubberized asphalt.

Only Alternatives 2 and 3 would require relocation of the Almond Avenue soundwall. Caltrans/OCTA have considered design options to avoid relocation of the soundwall under Alternatives 2 and 3. With respect to a 4-ft-wide shoulder, please see Common Response – Almond Avenue Soundwall.